



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

242

CRR-2565-2025 (O&M)
Reserved on: 11.05.2026.
Date of decision: 29.05.2026.
Uploaded on: 29.05.2026.

Whether only operative part of the judgment is pronounced or the full judgment is pronounced.	Full judgment
---	---------------

DEVENDER KUMAR ...Petitioner(s)
VERSUS

STATE OF HARYANA ...Respondent(s)
CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VINOD S. BHARDWAJ

Present :- Mr. Ram Darshan Yadav, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

Mr. Onkar Singh Wahla, Sr. DAG, Haryana.

VINOD S. BHARDWAJ, J.

The present criminal revision petition has been preferred against the judgment of conviction dated 08.01.2020 and order of sentence dated 10.01.2020 passed by the Judicial Magistrate First Class, Rewari, in criminal case bearing No.307 of 2015, arising out of FIR bearing No.196 dated 13.08.2015, under Sections 279, 337 and 304A of the Indian Penal Code, 1860, registered at Police Station Khol, whereby the revisionist-petitioner had been convicted and sentenced as under:-

Offence under Section	Sentence
279 IPC	SI for 6 months.
304A IPC	SI for 2 years with fine of Rs. 3000/- and in default of payment of fine to undergo SI for 1 month.

2. A further challenge is also made to the judgment dated 22.09.2025 passed by the Additional District and Sessions Judge, Rewari, in criminal appeal bearing CRA-16/2020 vide which the appeal filed by the petitioner has been dismissed.

3. Brief facts of the prosecution case are that on 13.08.2015, a telephonic information was received from Police Post, General Hospital, Rewari regarding the death of one Malkhan Singh after he had sustained injuries in a road accident. Upon receipt of the said information, EHC Bhagwan Singh reached the Government Hospital, Rewari, where statement of complainant Naresh Kumar was recorded. The complainant stated that he is a resident of Village Paira and that on the morning of 13.08.2015, he had gone to meet his uncle Malkhan Singh, who used to reside in his fields situated on Narnaul Road. It was further stated that the complainant along with his uncle Malkhan Singh intended to go to Village Hudia Khurd Gujjarkhai. According to the complainant, Malkhan Singh started from his residence situated in the fields on Narnaul Road towards Village Hudia Khurd on his motorcycle along with his wife Manju Devi, who was travelling as a pillion rider. The complainant further stated that he himself was following them on his motorcycle bearing registration No. HR-36V-1154. It was alleged that when Malkhan Singh reached near the Hudia turn ahead of Sitara Hotel, a pickup vehicle bearing registration No. RJ-32GB-0144, being driven in a rash and negligent manner, came from the side of Kund Barrier and collided head-on with the motorcycle being driven by Malkhan Singh. As per the complainant, due to the impact of the collision,

Malkhan Singh and his wife Manju Devi fell on the road and sustained multiple injuries. It was further alleged that immediately after the accident, the driver of the offending pickup vehicle fled away from the spot along with the vehicle. The complainant, however, asserted that he could identify the driver of the offending vehicle. The complainant further stated that both the injured persons were initially shifted to Arvind Hospital, from where they were referred to Government Hospital, Rewari for further treatment, however, upon reaching Government Hospital, Rewari, Malkhan Singh was declared brought dead by the attending doctors. On the basis of the aforesaid statement, the present FIR was registered.

4. During the course of investigation, the petitioners were arrested, statements of witnesses under Section 161 Cr.P.C. were recorded and the site plan of the place of occurrence was prepared. During the course of investigation, the offending pickup vehicle bearing registration No. RJ-32GB-0144 was taken into police possession. Thereafter, notice under Section 133 of the Motor Vehicles Act was issued to the registered owner of the aforesaid vehicle. Upon completion of investigation, the final report/challan was presented before the competent Court.

5. On presentation of the challan, copies thereof were supplied to the petitioner free of costs as provided under Section 207 of Cr.P.C.

6. On perusal of the material collected during investigation, a prima-facie case for the commission of offences punishable under Sections 279, 337 and 304A of Indian Penal Code was made out against the petitioner to which petitioner pleaded not guilty and claimed trial.

7. In a bid to prove its case against the petitioner, the prosecution examined the following witnesses:

PW1 : Beer Singh

PW2 : Naresh Kumar

PW3 : Shyam Kishore

PW4 : Jogender

PW5 : Sandeep Yadav

PW6 : Inspector Pawan Kumar

PW7 : EHC Bhagwan Singh

PW8 : HC Rajesh

8. Thereafter, the statement of the petitioner under Section 313 Cr.P.C. was recorded, wherein all incriminating circumstances appearing against him in the prosecution evidence were put to him. The petitioner denied the allegations levelled against him, pleaded innocence and asserted that he had been falsely implicated in the present case. The petitioner in defence evidence, merely tendered into evidence a copy of a order dated 13.08.2015 passed in case titled as State v. Devender arising out of FIR No. 381 dated 08.06.2014 registered at PS Nuh exhibited as Ex.DW1 and thereafter closed his defence evidence.

9. The parties were heard by the trial Court and after considering the evidence adduced and the rival submissions advanced, the petitioner was convicted and sentenced as mentioned above.

10. Aggrieved by the aforesaid judgment of conviction and sentence, the accused preferred Criminal Appeal before the Court of the

learned Additional District & Sessions Judge, Rewari. However, vide judgment dated 22.09.2025, the appeal was dismissed. Hence, the present revision petition.

11. Learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner contends that the judgment of conviction dated 08.01.2020 and the order of sentence dated 10.01.2020 passed by the learned Judicial Magistrate Ist Class, Rewari, as well as the judgment dated 22.09.2025 passed by the learned Additional Sessions Judge, Rewari dismissing the appeal preferred by the petitioner, are wholly unsustainable in the eyes of law and deserve to be set aside. It is argued that both the Courts have failed to properly appreciate the evidence available on record and have accorded undue weightage to the prosecution version while completely discarding and ignoring the material and circumstances brought forth by the defence.

12. Learned counsel further contends that even a bare reading of the prosecution evidence does not satisfy the essential ingredients necessary for constituting offences punishable under Sections 279 and 304-A IPC and that the prosecution has failed to establish rashness or negligence attributable to the petitioner beyond reasonable doubt.

13. It is further submitted that the name of the petitioner does not find mention in the FIR and that he was subsequently implicated during the course of investigation. Learned counsel argues that no Test Identification Parade was ever conducted by the investigating agency and that the petitioner was identified for the first time during trial before the Court, which substantially weakens the evidentiary value of such identification.

14. Learned counsel additionally contends that there is no cogent or reliable evidence on record to establish that the petitioner was driving the offending vehicle in a rash or negligent manner or that the accident in question occurred due to any negligence attributable to him.

15. It is further argued that there are numerous contradictions, inconsistencies and material improvements in the statements of the prosecution witnesses, which render the prosecution case doubtful. Learned counsel also submits that no independent eye-witness was associated by the prosecution to substantiate its version despite availability of such witnesses.

16. Learned counsel further contends that both the Courts gravely erred in declining the benefit of probation to the petitioner. It is submitted that the petitioner is a senior citizen, belongs to a poor family and is the sole breadwinner for his dependents. It is further argued that the petitioner has already suffered immense mental, emotional and physical agony on account of the prolonged criminal proceedings which have remained pending for approximately ten years.

17. Learned State counsel, on the other hand, vehemently opposes the present petition and contends that the judgments passed by both the Courts are based upon proper appreciation of oral as well as documentary evidence available on record and do not suffer from any illegality, perversity or misreading of evidence warranting interference by this Court in revisional jurisdiction. It is argued that the Trial Court as well as the Appellate Court have concurrently returned findings of guilt after detailed examination of the prosecution evidence and the same cannot be lightly disturbed merely

because the petitioner seeks a re-appreciation of evidence to arrive at an alternate view.

18. Learned State counsel further submits that the prosecution has successfully established all the essential ingredients constituting offences punishable under Sections 279 and 304-A IPC. It is contended that the evidence adduced on record clearly establishes that the offending vehicle was being driven in a rash and negligent manner and that the accident in question occurred solely due to the negligent driving of the petitioner, resulting in the death of Malkhan Singh.

19. It is further argued that mere non-mention of the petitioner's name in the FIR is not fatal to the prosecution case, particularly when his identity and involvement subsequently surfaced during the course of investigation. Learned State counsel contends that the complainant had specifically stated in his statement that he was capable of identifying the driver of the offending vehicle and the identity of the petitioner stood duly established during trial.

20. Learned State counsel additionally submits that absence of a Test Identification Parade does not ipso facto demolish the prosecution case, especially when the witnesses had sufficient opportunity to observe the accused at the time of occurrence and the identity of the petitioner otherwise stands established from the evidence brought on record.

21. It is further contended that the alleged contradictions and discrepancies pointed out by the petitioner are minor and natural in nature and do not go to the root of the prosecution case. Learned State counsel

argues that minor inconsistencies are bound to occur in statements of truthful witnesses due to lapse of time and variations in perception and memory and, rather than discrediting the prosecution case, lend assurance to the genuineness of the testimonies.

22. Learned State counsel further submits that merely because no independent witness was examined would not by itself render the prosecution case doubtful when the evidence of the prosecution witnesses has otherwise remained cogent, trustworthy and reliable. It is argued that conviction can very well be based upon the testimony of official or interested witnesses if the same inspires confidence.

23. Opposing the prayer for grant of probation, learned State counsel contends that the offence in question resulted in the loss of a human life due to rash and negligent driving and, therefore, the petitioner does not deserve the discretionary relief of probation merely on account of age or economic condition. It is argued that offences involving road fatalities are required to be dealt with seriously so as to send a deterrent message to society and to ensure adherence to road safety norms.

24. It is further contended that both the Courts have already considered the mitigating circumstances sought to be projected by the petitioner and thereafter passed well-reasoned judgments. Learned State counsel submits that no exceptional circumstance has been pointed out warranting interference with the sentence imposed upon the petitioner. It is contended that apart from the present case, the petitioner has six other pending cases of rash and negligent driving of which two are for offences

under Section 304A of IPC and he is also convicted in one more case of 304-A of IPC. Accordingly, learned State counsel prays that the present petition, being devoid of merit, deserves to be dismissed.

25. I have heard the counsel appearing for the parties and have gone through the record of the trial court as well as the appellate court.

26. Before proceeding further in the matter, it is deemed apposite to refer to the judgment rendered by the appellate court and the same is extracted as under:

“15. Now, in order to ascertain the authenticity of the prosecution case, this Court has re-appreciated the evidence present on the paper book, in backdrop of rival contentions of learned counsel for the parties and following point of determination arises before this Court:

“Whether the appellant-convict has committed the alleged accident by driving his pick-up vehicle bearing No. RJ-32GB-0144 in rash and negligent manner and thereby hit the motorcycle and caused death of Malkhan Singh on 13.08.2015 and has been rightly convicted for commission of the offences under Section 279 and 304A IPC by the learned Trial Court?”.

To unfold the real facts of the present case with regard to adjudication of above formulated point of determination, let us have a glance of prosecution evidence, where it has examined as many as eight witnesses to substantiate its case against the present convict. In the first set of witnesses, the case of

prosecution is duly supported by PW2 Complainant Naresh Kumar, who has reiterated the facts mentioned in his statement given to the police Ex.PW2/A, disclosing the mode and manner of fateful accident took place on 13.08.2015. This witness has categorically deposed that on that day he was following Malkhan Singh (since deceased) and Manju Devi, who were going ahead on their motorcycle to village Hudiya Khurd to mourn death of some known person. He further deposed that he was also riding on his motorcycle bearing No. HR36-V-1154 and when they reached near Sitara Hotel, then the aforesaid pick-up vehicle of white colour came from Kund Barrier side, which was being driven by its driver at very high speed and in unbalanced manner and directly hit the motorcycle of his uncle Malkhan Singh. This witness categorically deposed that due to the injuries suffered in the aforesaid accident, his uncle Malkhan Singh succumbed to the injuries and his aunt Manju Devi was also got injured. This witness has identified the convict Devender present before the learned Trial Court as driver of the offending pick up vehicle bearing No. RJ-32GB-0144 at the time of accident and who ran away from the spot in his presence, while leaving his vehicle. Needless to say, that this witness has not only supported the prosecution case in credible manner, rather duly sketched out the rashness and negligence on the part of convict Devender, while driving the offending

pick up vehicle RJ-32GB-0144 at the time of accident.

16. At this stage, while considering the contention of learned Defence Counsel regarding some discrepancies in the testimony of PW2 Naresh Kumar during cross-examination, this Court observes that the pointed part of depositions of aforesaid witness are not sufficient to discard the primary version of prosecution case. As per learned Defence Counsel, the testimony of this witness is not reliable as he is relative of deceased Malkhan Singh and he has admitted in his cross-examination that staff and other persons of Sitara Hotel were present, but none of them was examined as prosecution witness. Learned Defence Counsel has also contended that PW2 Naresh Kumar has also admitted that he could not talk with the convict on the spot who ran away from the spot. But these alleged minor discrepancies are not sufficient to dent the credibility of PW2 Naresh Kumar, where the defence has failed to explicit the manner where his relation with the deceased Malkhan Singh has effected his testimony qua the role of convict in the alleged accident. On the contrary, he is natural witness of the incident as all of them were going to mourn death of someone of their relative at village Hudiya Khurd and as per prevailing customs, the family members used to go together to attend such events. In the same manner, the version of PW2 Naresh Kumar also sounds credible where he states that the convict did not talk

with him on the spot and ran away, which is the much natural course for driver of an offending vehicle met with major accident, to ran away from the spot immediately. Had the convict was not on mistake in the aforesaid accident, he would have remained present on the spot and tried to help the injured persons. Thus, the conduct of convict itself speaks about his involvement and negligence in the aforesaid accident.

17. At this stage, this Court is also guided by the dicta of Hon'ble Apex Court in case titled Sucha Singh and Another Vs. State of Punjab 2004(1) CCC SC 1, wherein it was observed that "Relationship is not a factor to affect credibility of the witness- a relation would not conceal actual culprit and make allegations against an innocent person-foundation has to be lead if plea of false implication is made and Court has to adopt a careful approach and analyse evidence to find out whether it is cogent and credible".

18. Furthermore, the case of prosecution is also supported by testimony of PW3 Shyam Kishore, Motor Mechanic, who has proved the mechanical inspection report of the offending pick up vehicle bearing No. RJ-32GB-0144 Ex.PW3/A, which depicts that it was found that the left side bumper, left front mudguard, left head light and left side bonnet have been damaged and bent. Thus, when the aforesaid mechanical inspection report is seen with the site plan Ex.PW8/D of the spot of incident, it

clearly shows that the motorcycle of deceased Malkhan Singh was going in correct side of the road i.e. left side and the offending pick up vehicle bearing No. RJ-32GB-0144 had hit the same from the back side. Had the motorcycle of deceased Malkhan Singh was not plying on correct side of the road, the offending pick up vehicle bearing No. RJ-32GB-0144 could not hit that motorcycle from behind without damaging its left side bumper, mudguard and other connected parts as detailed in mechanical inspection report Ex.PW3/A. Thus, the rash and negligent driving on the part of convict Devender Kumar being driver of the offending pick up vehicle bearing No. RJ-32GB-0144 at the time of alleged accident dated 13.08.2015 is duly proved.

19. Furthermore, the prosecution has also proved the investigation proceedings by examining investigating officer of this case PW8 HC Rajesh, who has detailed the formal investigation proceedings, beside proving the documents prepared and collected during investigation. This witness has proved the proceedings Ex.PW8/A, inquest proceedings Ex.PW8/B, Post-Mortem report application Ex.PW8/C, site plan Ex.PW8/D, FIR Ex.PW8/F and endorsement Ex.PW8/G. Further PW7 EHC Bhagwan Singh has also identified his signatures over the possession memo of the offending pick up vehicle bearing No. RJ-32GB-0144 Ex.PW7/A, disclosure

statement of accused Devender Ex.PW7/B, being witness. Both the aforesaid witnesses have withstood with the marathon cross-examination conducted by learned Defence Counsel before the learned Trial Court and apart from some formal suggestions, no material discrepancy could be fetched out from their respective testimonies. At this stage, this Court is not inclined to accept the contention of learned Defence Counsel, where he has contended that no independent witness was joined in investigation by the investigating officer despite availability. Here, in view of the present scenario of our society these days, the counter arguments of prosecution sounds more logical that the passersby or the persons gathered on the spot are mostly just spectators and they usually least interested to become witness in the investigation proceedings, therefore, non-joining of independent witness by the investigating officer is not fatal to the prosecution case, where it is otherwise duly proved by the testimonies of eye-witnesses and other corroborative evidence. It is apt to note here that no doubt can be raised upon the law laid down by Hon'ble Courts in the cases cited by learned Defence Counsel but the same are not applicable here due to distinguishable facts. Law is well settled that a little difference in facts, may lead to an entirely different conclusion. Moreover, the observations of Hon'ble Apex Court in case titled State of U.P. Vs. Krishna Master and Others 2010(3) SLJ SC 1814, are

relevant here, where it was observed that “minor discrepancies on trivial matter snot touching the core of the case, hyper technical approach by taking sentences torn out of context here and there from the evidence, attaching importance to some technical error committed by the investigating officer not going to the roots of the matter, could not ordinarily permit rejection of the evidence as a whole”.

20. Now, coming to the next point regarding cause of death of deceased Malkhan Singh i.e. injured in the alleged accident dated 13.08.2015 committed by the convict being the offending pick up vehicle bearing No. RJ-32GB-0144. To substantiate this aspect, the prosecution has examined PW4 Dr. Jogender Tanwer, who has proved the post-mortem report of deceased Malkhan Singh Ex.PW4/A, by identifying his signatures over the same. Further, the post-mortem report Ex.PW4/A goes to show that deceased Malkhan Singh was injured in RSA (road side accident) on 13.08.2015 as per the police information. Further, the cause of death of deceased Malkhan Singh is noted as “in my opinion cause of death in this case is due to multiple injuries which are ante-mortem in nature, leading to hemorrhagic shock i.e. sufficient to cause death in ordinary course of nature of life.” Thus, the prosecution has been able to prove that deceased Malkhan Singh was expired due to the injuries sustained by him in the accident dated 13.08.2015, committed by

the convict Devender by driving the offending pick up vehicle bearing No. RJ-32GB-0144 in rash and negligent manner.

21. Lastly, the contention of learned Defence Counsel regarding plea of alibi of convict Devender at the time of alleged accident dated 13.08.2015 on the basis of order of learned JMIC, Mewat dated 13.08.2015 in case titled State Vs. Devender Sharma, is also not sustainable in the eyes of law. Admittedly, the impugned order dated 13.08.2015 does not bear the time, when the convict Devender had attended the aforesaid Court, which could be any time during Court hours from 10:00 AM to 04:00 PM. Moreover, the defence has not even bothered to examine any person such as his learned counsel etc. in the aforesaid case at Mewat, before the learned Trial Court in support of his plea. Therefore, in view of this Court, learned Trial Court has rightly discarded the plea of alibi taken by the convict as not sustainable. Thus, the case of the prosecution stands established beyond the shadow of reasonable doubts and there is nothing on record to show that the Learned Trial Court has erred in its findings having come to the conclusion about commission of the offence by the convict under Section 279 and 304A IPC.

22. Before parting with the present matter, this court also not inclined to extend the relief of probation to the convict as he is repeated offender, facing other case of same nature as reflected by his own document Ex. D1, in case titled State Vs Devender

FIR no. 381 dated 08.06.2014 U/s 279, 304A IPC, PS. Nuh. On this point, this court is guided by dicta of Hon'ble Apex Court in case titled "Dalbir Singh vs State Of Haryana AIR 2000 SC 1677, 2000" wherein it was held that "Bearing in mind the galloping trend in road accidents in India and the devastating consequences visiting the victims and their families, criminal courts cannot treat the nature of the offence under Section 304A IPC as attracting the benevolent provisions of Section 4 of the P.O. Act. While considering the quantum of sentence, to be imposed for the offence of causing death by rash or negligent driving of automobiles, one of the prime considerations should be deterrence. A professional driver pedals the accelerator of the automobile almost throughout his working hours. He must constantly inform himself that he cannot afford to have a single moment of laxity or inattentiveness when his leg is on the pedal of a vehicle in locomotion. He cannot and should not take a chance think that a rash driving need not necessarily cause any accident; or even if any accident occurs it need not necessarily result in the death of any human being; or even if such death ensues he might not be convicted of the offence; and lastly that even if he is convicted he would be dealt with leniently by the court. He must always keep in his mind the fear psyche that if he is convicted of the offence for causing death of a human being due to his callous driving of vehicle he cannot escape

from jail sentence. This is the role which the courts can play, particularly at the level of trial courts, for lessening the high rate of motor accidents due to callous driving of automobiles. Thus, bestowing our serious consideration on the arguments addressed by the learned counsel for the appellant we express our inability to lean to the benevolent provision to Section 4 of the P.O. Act.”

23. With such opinion, the above formulated point of determination stands decided against the appellant-convict.”

27. It is evident from a perusal of the judgment passed by the Appellate Court that the entire evidence available on record was appreciated in detail while examining the correctness of the findings recorded by the Trial Court. It was noticed that the prosecution had examined as many as eight witnesses in support of its case and that the testimony of PW-2 complainant Naresh Kumar fully supported the prosecution version. The said witness deposed that he was following deceased Malkhan Singh and Manju Devi on his motorcycle and had witnessed the offending pickup vehicle being driven at a very high speed and in an unbalanced manner before it directly collided with the motorcycle of the deceased. The Appellate Court further noticed that the witness had specifically identified the petitioner-convict as the driver of the offending vehicle who had fled away from the spot after the accident.

28. The Appellate Court also considered the objections raised on

behalf of the petitioner regarding discrepancies in the testimony of PW-2 and rightly concluded that the same were minor in nature and insufficient to discredit the core prosecution case. It was specifically noticed that merely because the witness happened to be related to the deceased would not by itself render his testimony unreliable, particularly when his presence at the spot was found natural and probable. The conduct of the petitioner in fleeing from the spot immediately after the accident was also taken note of as an incriminating circumstance pointing towards his involvement and negligence.

29. The Appellate Court further relied upon the mechanical inspection report Ex.PW3/A proved through PW-3 Shyam Kishore, which showed damage to the left side bumper, mudguard and connected portions of the offending pickup vehicle. The said evidence, when read conjointly with the site plan Ex.PW8/D, clearly established that the motorcycle of the deceased was being driven on the correct side of the road and that the offending pickup vehicle had struck it from behind, thereby substantiating the rash and negligent driving of the petitioner.

30. The investigation proceedings and documentary evidence produced on record were also found proved through testimonies of PW-7 and PW-8, who withstood cross-examination without any material contradiction being elicited. The Appellate Court further observed that non-joining of independent witnesses was not fatal to the prosecution case in the facts and circumstances of the present matter, particularly when the prosecution version otherwise stood corroborated by trustworthy ocular as

well as documentary evidence.

31. The medical evidence was also found to be fully supportive of the prosecution case. The Appellate Court noticed that PW-4 Dr. Jogender Tanwer had duly proved the post-mortem report Ex.PW4/A, wherein the cause of death was opined to be hemorrhagic shock resulting from multiple ante-mortem injuries sustained in the road accident. Thus, a direct nexus between the accident caused by the offending vehicle and the death of Malkhan Singh stood conclusively established.

32. The plea of alibi raised by the petitioner was also examined and rightly rejected by the Appellate Court after noticing that the document relied upon by the petitioner did not even disclose the time of his appearance before the Court at Mewat and no independent witness was examined by the defence to substantiate the said plea.

33. The learned Appellate Court further rightly declined the benefit of probation after noticing that the petitioner was also facing another criminal case of similar nature under Sections 279 and 304-A IPC. Reliance was appropriately placed upon the judgment of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in Dalbir Singh vs State of Haryana emphasizing the necessity of deterrence in cases involving death caused by rash and negligent driving.

34. It is noticeable that the petitioner has 06 other pending cases for rash and negligent driving. Of the above, two cases are for the offences under Section 304A of IPC and he also has another conviction for the offence under Section 304A. It thus remains undisputed that the petitioner is a habitual offender and has repeated involvement in similar nature of

offence. The petitioner has thus not reformed himself and has continued to endanger lives of people.

35. In view of the detailed and cogent appreciation of evidence undertaken by both the Courts, this Court finds no perversity, illegality, misreading or non-appreciation of evidence warranting interference in revisional jurisdiction. The prosecution has been able to establish the guilt of the petitioner beyond reasonable doubt and the findings concurrently recorded by the Trial Court as well as the Appellate Court are based upon proper appreciation of evidence available on record. Consequently, finding no merit in the present petition, the same is accordingly dismissed.

36. The present petition is accordingly **dismissed**.

37. Pending misc. application(s), if any, shall also stand(s) disposed of accordingly.

38. Let a copy of this order be also sent to the licensing authority for taking appropriate action against the petitioner, under the Motor Vehicles Act, 1988 given his involvement in such large number of repeated offences.

29 May, 2026.

Sumit Gusain

(VINOD S. BHARDWAJ)
JUDGE

<i>Whether speaking/reasoned</i>	<i>: Yes/No</i>
<i>Whether reportable</i>	<i>: Yes/No</i>